



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Western Republicans in Congress have maintained with great zeal the theory of protection to American industries. Their interest in coast defenses has not been less than that of those who live on the seaboard. The demand for a navy commensurate in strength with our national greatness and national danger has found its strongest advocates among the representatives of the States that could not be disturbed by a hostile force by land or sea.

The American spirit is strong in the West. An insult to our flag would be resented by the people of the West as it would in no other part of the country. They would not inquire what it would cost nor how it would affect trade and commerce. There will never be two Republics made out of this one. The West will never desire it, and if the East ever does the West will prevent it.

A common flag, a common ancestry, a common interest, justice to all in legislation and administration, will keep the States in a Union never to be broken by foreign or domestic foe.

H. M. TELLER.

---

#### OTHER PRESIDENTS THAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN.

IN his article in the May issue of the REVIEW on "Men Who Might Have Been Presidents," Mr. Joseph M. Rogers shows that some very slight accidents, circumstances, in fact, that could not be supposed at the time of their occurrence to be important—turned the Presidential prize in more than one election the way it went. How many times those who came so near being President and yet failed, through overlooking these apparently trifling circumstances, regretted their short foresight, one cannot know. But, no doubt, the involuntary reminiscence occasioned by these strays from fortune was frequent to these men. Webster's failure to get the Presidential office, which Mr. Rogers recalls to us, probably shortened his life.

Putting sentiment and moralizing aside, however, I am certain there are other instances than those Mr. Rogers cites where this close proximity to the Chief Magistracy can be shown. There was one, at least, of which I got the particulars from my father when I was a mere school boy. At the time of the Harrisburg Convention of December, 1839, which nominated Harrison and Tyler for its candidates for the election of 1840, there was a strongly talked of candidate from New York for Vice-President—Mr. Nathaniel P. Tallmadge, of Poughkeepsie. He was not only a rising and brilliant lawyer, but he had held public offices of large importance, the most conspicuous being that of United States Senator.

His career, in fact, seemed so flattering from his own point of view that he hoped it possible, when the claims of more notable men clashed sufficiently to prevent their nomination, to be actually nominated himself for President. So, to check the effort made to give him the second place on the ticket, he put a carefully written letter of declination in the hands of Dr. William Thomas, of Poughkeepsie, a delegate to Harrisburg, which, it is believed prevented his easy nomination to what became Tyler's place.

It is well known that at this convention the second place on the ticket was not greatly coveted, and the delegates were a good deal at seas as to a candidate. Mr. Rogers thinks that Tyler got the Vice-Presidential proffer on account of his tears over Clay's defeat for nomination to the first place. But the current tradition has always been that Tyler was put on to secure the vote

of Virginia, which at that time and afterward held the same sort of pivotal place in a Presidential contest as Indiana has held in later days.

A second instance of Presidential meanness, which may claim a place in Mr. Rogers' list, recalls another U. S. Senator from New York—Hon. Daniel S. Dickinson. It also recalls the old importance of Virginia in Presidential elections. Mr. Dickinson, it has always been said, could have had the nomination for President at Baltimore in 1852 if he had accepted the proffer of Virginia's delegates to support him for the place which went almost by accident to Franklin Pierce. Being committed to the interests of Lewis Cass, he would not surrender them. If he had done this thing, analogous examples of which later history can furnish, he, and not Mr. Pierce, would have won the election over General Scott, who only carried four States.

But Mr. Dickinson preferred loyalty to his trust, and the steadiness of his adhesion to it was all the more notable since he felt at the time that he was throwing away the Presidency to serve a friend; and, for no other purpose, at the end, than to be unimpeachably faithful to him.

JOEL BENTON.

---

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT THE "OPIUM WAR"

A VERY common feature of any discussion in the United States of the trade or commercial policy of England in respect to other nations, is the preference of a charge against her, of having, more than a half a century ago, instituted a war "in order to force poor China to take the opium that England was trying to compel her to import, no matter what the great evils resulting." For this charge, which has been popularly regarded as irrefutable, there is no good or sufficient warrant, further than that complete evidence to the contrary has only within a recent period become popularly accessible through the publication of English state papers; although the would-be American authorities on this subject might, in at least a degree, have become cognizant of the exact truth (as will be presently shown), had they taken the trouble to acquaint themselves with the published results of an investigation of this subject by one of their own and greatest statesmen. A summary of the indisputable facts in the case are as follows:

Previous to the inception of the so-called "opium war" between England and China (*i.e.*, in 1840), opium was cultivated in no less than ten of the provinces of China, and its importation was permitted and regularly taxed, the same as any other imports. Opium, the product of India, was imported into China by the East India Company under such circumstances, and without inhibition; but to an estimated extent of more than two per cent. of what would be necessary to meet the demand of the whole Chinese population. The charge that England first introduced opium into China has, therefore, not the slightest foundation in facts.

Some time previous to 1840 the Chinese government prohibited not merely its importation but its use for any purpose, and any violation of these enactments was made a capital offence. As the appetite for opium on the part of the Chinese was not thereby extinguished, the business of smuggling and illicit dealing became very great, and is now known to have been largely participated in by the very Chinese officials whose business it was to enforce the law. The Chinese government, furthermore, was not successful in enforcing their law against opium. What was then also the policy of the British government towards China is demonstrated by the